

IN THE CLAIMS

1. (Currently Amended) A method for determining the correct escheat state for abandoned property, said method comprising:

inputting a property owner address into a computer having a processor;

the processor comparing the property owner address, including street address, city, state, and zip code, to a US Postal Service certified data base apparatus; and

the processor assigning a probable escheat state based on the comparison of the property owner addresses with the US Postal Service certified data base apparatus; and

the processor assigning a confidence code to the escheat state.

2. (Canceled)

3. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor making corrections to property owner address based on the comparison.

4. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor filtering non-address information from the property owner address prior to said step of comparing.

5. (Original) The method according to claim 4, wherein:

the non-address information includes legal designations of the type of property ownership.

6. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor assigning at least one alternate escheat state based on the comparison.

7. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor comparing the property owner address to a list of foreign country names; and

the processor flagging the property owner addresses which include foreign country names that match the list.

8. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor comparing the property owner address to a list of non-state location designations.

9. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 3, further comprising:

the processor indicating which addresses were corrected.

10. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 9, further comprising:
the processor indicating the type of correction made.

11. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim ~~[[2]]~~ 1, wherein:

said confidence code represents 100% if the property owner address has an exact match in the US Postal Service certified data base apparatus, and

said confidence code is based on a ratio of possible matches when an exact match is not found.

12. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address zip code when city and state are correct but the zip code is incorrect by the comparison.

13. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address state when the city and zip code are correct but the state is incorrect by the comparison.

14. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address state when the zip code is incorrect and the state is ambiguous because the city name exists in more than one state, said step of correcting the property owner address state including a statistical

analysis by the processor of the number of zip codes for the city in each state having the city.

15. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 14, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected high threshold by the processor.

16. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 15, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison by the processor to a user selected low threshold.

17. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

prior to said step of the processor comparing, the processor filtering the property owner addresses based on user supplied suppression data.

18. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor indicating how the probable escheat state was assigned.

19. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim ~~[[2]]~~1, further comprising:

the processor generating a report that defines the composition of an abandoned property database and summarizes metrics by the confidence code.

20. (Original) The method according to claim 1, wherein:

said method is performed with a computer coupled to the Internet.

21. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for determining the correct escheat state for abandoned property, said apparatus comprising:

a data base server including means for comparing an uploaded address to a list of addresses stored in a data base;

a network server coupled to said data base server;

a network coupled to the network server;

a remote terminal coupled to the network, said terminal including means for uploading an address to said data base server via said network and said network server; and

a printer coupled to said terminal, wherein

said terminal having a terminal processor programmed to upload ~~uploads~~ an address to said data base server, said data base server having a server processor programmed to compare ~~compares~~ the uploaded addresses to addresses in the data base and said server processor being programmed to download ~~downloads~~ the result of the comparison to said terminal, said terminal processor being programmed to output the results of the comparison ~~being output by said terminal~~ to said printer, the results including the indication of an escheat state and a ~~probability that the indication is correct~~ confidence code.

22. (Cancelled)

23. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, wherein:

the data base server corrects the uploaded address based on the comparison.

24. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, wherein:

the data base server filters non-address information from the uploaded address prior to comparing the uploaded addresses to addresses in the data base.

25. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 24, wherein:

the non-address information includes legal designations of the type of property ownership.

26. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server assigning at least one alternate escheat state based on the comparison and the results including the at least one alternate escheat state.

27. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server comparing the uploaded address to a list of foreign country names; and

the data base server flagging the addresses which include foreign country names that match the list.

28. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the data base server comparing the addresses to a list of non-state location designations.

29. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 23, further comprising:
the data base server indicating which addresses were corrected.

30. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 29, further comprising:
the data base server indicating the type of correction made.

31. (Currently Amended) The apparatus according to claim ~~[[22]]~~ 21, wherein:
said confidence code represents 100% if the uploaded address has an exact match in the US Postal Service certified data base, and
said confidence code is based on a ratio of possible matches when an exact match is not found.

32. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the data base server correcting the uploaded address zip code when city and state are correct but the zip code is incorrect by the comparison.

33. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the data base server correcting the uploaded address state when the city and zip code are correct but the state is incorrect by the comparison.

34. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the data base server correcting the uploaded address state when the zip code is incorrect and the state is ambiguous because the city name exists in more than one state, the data base server performing a statistical analysis of the number of zip codes for the city in each state having the city.

35. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 34, wherein:
the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected high threshold.

36. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 35, wherein:
the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected low threshold.

37. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the data base server filtering the uploaded addresses based on user supplied suppression data.

38. (Previously Presented) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:
the results indicating how the probable escheat state was assigned.